

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 15, 17, 19 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0074473 to Pham et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,065,055 to Hughes et al. The Examiner has further rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al., in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023671 to Abdulrahiman et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126086 to Safadi. Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143780 to Gorman. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0193609 to Phan et al.

The Pham et al. publication discloses a scalable network gateway processor architecture.

The Hughes et al. patent discloses an inappropriate site management software, which includes incrementing the filter hits during scan intervals, i.e., periodic filtering.

Claim 13 (as well as claim 25) includes:

"A method of filtering and storing information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices;

- b) storing, in a content directory, the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; and

- c) searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device;

wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device, is performed independently of said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device."

The Examiner has indicated that the step "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information..." is taught by Pham et al. at page 5, paragraph [0050], lines 1-19, "Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92".

Applicants believe that the Examiner misunderstands the subject invention. In particular, there is no filtering of information describing characteristics of content in Pham et al. In particular, the noted paragraph (in its entirety) of Pham et al. states:

"[0050] Finally, an array of high-speed memory 100 is provided to satisfy the external memory and program storage requirements of the network processor 92. Included within this memory 100 is a data table 102 providing a dynamic data store for accumulated routing and filtering information. For implementations of the ingress processor 80 utilized in preferred embodiments of the present invention, the data table 102 also stores network connection SA parameter data. The route and filtering data are accumulated in a conventional manner from inspection of the attached interfaces and the source addresses of data packets received through the interfaces. The SA parameter data is explicitly provided and, as appropriate, modified and deleted by the control processor 84 in response to the creation, maintenance, and dropping of IPsec connections that are routed through the VPN gateway 72. Preferably, the SA parameter data is used by the ingress processor 80 to dynamically create and attach SA headers to each received IPsec data packet. Thus, in accordance with the preferred embodiment of the present invention, each IPsec data packet transferred to a crypto processor 86 is packaged with all of the necessary SA information needed for IPsec protocol processing."

While the above section of Pham et al. refers to "filtering data", this filtering relates to updating and

maintaining stored network connection SA parameter data, "The SA parameter data is explicitly provided and, as appropriate, modified and deleted by the control processor 84 in response to the creation, maintenance, and dropping of IPsec connections that are routed through the VPN gateway 72." As indicated by Pham et al. at page 3, paragraph [0039], lines 12-15, "In the case of the IPsec protocol, a network exchange is required to mutually establish various secure authority (SA) parameters for the encryption and decryption of data." However, as noted by Pham et al., "Preferably, the SA parameter data is used by the ingress processor 80 to dynamically create and attach SA headers to each received IPsec data packet." Hence, the SA parameter data is not information describing characteristic of the content, but rather, the SA parameter data describes characteristics for encrypting and decrypting data and is used for processing the (content). This SA parameter data is obtained from each of the devices in the network. Hence, the filtered SA parameter data does not yield "yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Examiner has further indicated that Pham et al. discloses the limitation "storing, in a content directory, the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device", and again cites paragraph [0050], lines 1-6 of Pham et al.

Again, Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, as noted in Pham et al., "Included within this memory 100 is a data table 102 providing a dynamic data store for accumulated routing and filtering information." However, as should be clear from Pham et al., this accumulated routing and filtering information is the filtered SA parameter data, in which there is no information about content, and whether or not this content is or is not capable of being rendered by at least one network rendering device.

It appears that the Examiner acknowledges that Pham et al. does not teach "periodic filtering", and uses the Hughes et al. patent to supply such a limitation.

The Examiner then tries to use Hughes et al. as teaching "filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information)."

Applicants note that this section of Hughes et al. states: "At the end of the scan interval, module 1 adds the number of attempts to access blocked material, by user, to a running total of attempts carried since the totals were reset." Applicants submit that this is not a disclosure of filtering of information, but rather, statistics of how many times attempts were made to access blocked information.

Claim 14 includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by at any of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a format that is not compatible

with the any of the plurality of network rendering devices", while claim 15 includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with any of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Abdulrahiman et al. publication discloses a wireless information transmission system and method, in which an electronic device contains a listing 150 of supported or compatible data formats and a plurality of applications or programs 155. The listing 150 may be maintained in the electronic device and may be forwarded to a proxy server.

The Examiner has indicated that Abdulrahiman et al. discloses the limitations of claims 14 (page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, paragraph [0039], lines 3-5) and 15 (page 3, paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, paragraph [0031], lines 5-6).

Applicants submit that Abdulrahiman et al. teaches, with regard to claim 14, the possible existence of content having a format that is incompatible with a particular electronic device. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of using the listings 150 of all of the electronic devices to in order to perform the step "periodically filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices" as set forth in claim 13.

The Safadi publication discloses methods and apparatus for digital rights management.

The subject invention, as claimed in claim 16, includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices, comprises content having a DRM system that is not supported by any of the plurality of network rendering devices."

The Examiner has indicated that Safadi teaches this limitation and points out page 2, paragraph 21, lines 1-2.

Applicants believe that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, the noted section of Safadi states "The present invention provides methods and apparatus for digital rights management (DRM)." However, referring to the ensuing lines 2-8, Safadi states "In particular, the present invention enables digital rights management of content from a plurality of content providers so that content protected by various DRM schemes may be downloaded, played and/or viewed from a single consumer device, without regard to the original DRM scheme used to protect the content." As such, if Saladi were to be applied to the subject invention, then there would not be any content that would meet the limitation of claim 16. In other words, Saladi teaches away from the subject invention.

Further, Applicants submit that Saladi does not disclose that which is missing from Pham et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of information

describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Gorman publication teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.

Claim 18 includes the limitation "wherein said periodic filtering of information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at any of the plurality of network rendering devices, is performed when a network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is removed from the network."

As noted by the Examiner, Gorman states, on page 4, paragraph 55, lines 12-14: "It is noted that the sorting priority list can be updated to reflect that the user deleted filter criteria from the filter cells."

However, Applicants submit that Gorman does not supply that which is missing from Pham et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Phan et al. publication discloses a master content directory service server for providing a consolidated network-wide content directory.

Claim 21, includes the limitation "wherein the network is a UPnP network, and the information describing characteristics of the content is stored by an UPnP content directory service."

The Examiner indicates that Phan et al. teaches "a master content directory service representing all of the content within the network. (Abstract lines 1-3). Phan also teaches a UPnP architecture defining general interaction between UPnP control points and UpnP network devices (Page 2 - paragraph [0020], Page 3 - paragraph [0024]); and the information about content is stored by an UPnP content directory service Page 2 - paragraph [0020] lines 12-16, Page 5 - paragraph [0040] lines 7-12)."

Applicants, however, submit that Phan et al. does not supply that which is missing from Pham et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices".

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 13-27, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611